

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II are related as process of making and product made under M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f) and that the device of Group II may be prepared by chemical means instead of electrografting as required in the process of Group I.

However, the Examiner has given no reasons to support the assertion that the composite surface comprising composite portions and/or semiconductive portions onto which are locally electrografted organic molecules onto fine chosen areas of said conductive and/or semiconductive portions may be prepared by a chemical means, nor does the Examiner set forth any specific chemical means which may be used to produce the composite surface of the claims of Group II. Therefore, it is submitted that the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f) have not been met and it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Further, Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that thousands of U.S. patents have issued in which many more than two subclasses have been searched and the Patent and Trademark Office cannot reasonably assert that a burden exists in searching only two subclasses.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Roland E. Martin
Registration No. 48,082